

ITEM NO.6

COURT NO.2

SECTION II

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl) No(s).3496/2009

(From the judgement and order dated 14/08/2008 in
of The HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT N. DELHI)

CRLR No. 686/2004

GHANSHYAMDAS CHOPRA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES, N.DELHI

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for stay)

WITH SLP(Crl) NO. 3752 of 2009

SLP(Crl) NO. 8189 of 2009

((With appln.(s) for stay and office report))

SLP(Crl) NO. 8191 of 2009

(With appln.(s) for ex-parte stay and office report)

Date: 17/03/2011 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALTAMAS KABIR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CYRIAC JOSEPH

For Petitioner(s)

Petitioner-In-Person.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Ashok K. Srivastava, Adv.

In SR 3496/08

Ms. Sushma Suri, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Out of four matters, which are on
board today, two matters are listed before us for
final disposal, being SLP(Crl.)No.3496 of 2009
2

and SLP(Crl.)No.3752 of 2009.

Both the SLPs are

directed against a common judgment dated 14th

August, 2008, passed by the Delhi High Court in

Criminal Revision Nos.686 and 664 of 2008.

2. The petitioner, appearing in

person, has submitted that the learned Additional

Chief Metropolitan Magistrate by his order dated

3rd February, 2010, discharged the petitioner along with the other accused in Compliant Case, being CC No.1077 of 2003, made by the Registrar of the Companies under Sections 62 and 68 of the Companies Act, 1956, since the same had been quashed by the High Court.

3. A copy of the said order dated 3rd February, 2010, has been annexed to the written submissions filed by the petitioner appearing in person.

4. Having regard to the above, nothing further remains in SLP(Crl.)No.3496 of 2009, which, in fact, was directed against the order of the High Court in regard to the complaint filed under Sections 62 and 68 of the Companies Act. The said Special Leave Petition is, therefore, disposed of as having become infructuous.

5. Consequently, SLP(Crl.)No.8189 of 2009, has also become infructuous, except as pointed out by the petitioner, that a cost of Rs.5000/- had been imposed by the order passed on the review petition.

6. Since the petitioner has been discharged from the case, while recording that the SLP(Crl.)No.8189 of 2009 has also become infructuous on merits, we quash that portion of the order imposing costs.

7. As far as SLP(Crl.)No.3752 of 2009 is concerned, let the same be listed, along with SLP(Crl.)No.8191 of 2009, two weeks after the summer vacation.

(Sheetal Dhingra)
Court Master

(Veena Khera)
Court Master